REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-20, at page 2 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,990,591 ("Pearson"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,013,482 ("Krumel"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The cited portions of Pearson and Krumel do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest a controller operable in a learning mode to dynamically adjust content of an undesirable material content list according to monitored user activity, the learning mode selectable by at least one interface mode adjustment switch, as in claim 1.

In contrast to claim 1, Pearson discloses a switch for adjusting a security level of a firewall. Each level is associated with a different security policy. The levels are labeled by Pearson as High, Medium and Low to denote the levels of security a user can select. Pearson FIG. 4a, col. 10, ll. 50-65. Thus, in Pearson, a user can select a fixed security level that implements a pre-defined security policy. The cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest dynamic adjustment of the security policies. Therefore, the cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest a controller operable in a learning mode to dynamically adjust content of an undesirable material content list according to monitored user activity, the learning mode selectable by at least one interface mode adjustment switch, as in claim 1.

In further contrast to claim 1, Krumel discloses a packet filtering mechanism that can be set with switches. Krumel, col. 2, l. 65-col 3, l. 10. The packet filtering mechanism of Krumel does not dynamically adjust content of an undesirable material content list. Therefore, the cited portions of Krumel do not disclose or suggest a controller operable in a learning mode to dynamically adjust content of an undesirable material content list according to monitored user activity, the learning mode selectable by at least one interface mode adjustment switch, as in claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-11 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

The cited portions of Pearson and Krumel do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 12. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest that in a learning mode a controller is able to <u>dynamically</u> adjust content of an undesirable material content list <u>according to monitored user activity</u>, as in claim 12.

In contrast to claim 12, Pearson discloses a switch for adjusting a security level of a firewall. Each level is associated with a different security policy. The levels are labeled by Pearson as High, Medium and Low to denote the levels of security a user can select. Pearson FIG. 4a, col. 10, ll. 50-65. Thus, in Pearson, a user can select a <u>fixed</u> security level that implements a pre-defined security policy. The cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest <u>dynamic</u> adjustment of the security policies. Therefore, the cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest that in a learning mode a controller is able to <u>dynamically</u> adjust content of an undesirable material content list <u>according to monitored user activity</u>.

In further contrast to claim 12, Krumel discloses a packet filtering mechanism that can be set with switches. Krumel, col. 2, l. 65-col 3, l. 10. The packet filtering mechanism of Krumel does not <u>dynamically</u> adjust content of an undesirable material content list. The cited portions of Krumel do not disclose or suggest that in a learning mode the controller is able to <u>dynamically</u> adjust content of an undesirable material content list <u>according to monitored user activity</u>.

Therefore the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 12. Hence, claim 12 is allowable. Claims 13-15 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 12.

The cited portions of Pearson and Krumel do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 16. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest that at least one selectable material content passage operating mode is a learning mode to dynamically adjust content of an undesirable material content according to monitored user activity, as in claim 16.

In contrast to claim 16, Pearson discloses a switch for adjusting a security level of a firewall. Each level is associated with a different security policy. The levels are labeled by Pearson as High, Medium and Low to denote the levels of security a user can select. Pearson FIG. 4a, col. 10, ll. 50-65. Thus, in Pearson, a user can select a _fixed_ security level that implements a pre-defined security policy. The cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest _dynamic_ adjustment of the security policies. Therefore, the cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest that at least one selectable material content passage operating mode is a learning mode to _dynamically_ adjust content of an undesirable material content list _according to monitored user activity_.

In further contrast to claim 16, Krumel discloses a packet filtering mechanism that can be set with switches. Krumel, col. 2, l. 65-col 3, l. 10. The packet filtering mechanism of Krumel does not _dynamically_ adjust content of an undesirable material content list. Therefore, the cited portions of Krumel do not disclose or suggest that at least one selectable material content passage operating mode is a learning mode to _dynamically_ adjust content of an undesirable material content list _according to monitored user activity_.

Therefore the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 16. Hence, claim 16 is allowable. Claims 17-20 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 16. Further, the dependent claims recite additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel.

For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest selecting a learning mode and learning allowable material content, as in claim 17. Pearson discloses a switch for adjusting a security level of a firewall. Each level is associated with a different security policy. The levels are labeled by Pearson as High, Medium and Low to denote the levels of security a user can select. Pearson FIG. 4a, col. 10, ll. 50-65. The security levels of Pearson are _fixed_. The cited portions of Pearson do not disclose or suggest selecting a learning mode and learning allowable material content. Krumel discloses a packet filtering mechanism that can be set with switches. Krumel, col. 2, l. 65-col 3, l. 10. The cited portions of Krumel do not disclose or suggest selecting a learning mode and learning allowable material content, as in claim 17. For at least this additional reason, claim 17 is allowable.

Claim 21 is Allowable

Claim 21 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 1. In addition, claim 21 recites additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest that a controller remains in a learning mode <u>for a predetermined length of time</u>, as in claim 21. For at least this additional reason, claim 21 is allowable.

Claim 22 is Allowable

Claim 22 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 12. In addition, claim 22 recites additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest that a controller remains in a learning mode <u>for a predetermined length of time</u>, as in claim 22. For at least this additional reason, claim 22 is allowable.

Claim 23 is Allowable

Claim 23 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 16. In addition, claim 23 recites additional elements not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel. For example, the cited portions of Pearson and Krumel fail to disclose or suggest that a controller remains in a learning mode <u>for a predetermined length of time</u>, as in claim 23. For at least this additional reason, claim 23 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the cited references as applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

2-12-2009
_____
Date

_____
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER LAW GROUP, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTIES
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)